

REMARKS

The Office Action of April 2, 2008 has been carefully reviewed and considered by Applicants. All claims (claims 9, 10, 12 and 18-22) remain in the application.

Reconsideration of the Application is hereby respectfully requested.

The Office Action

The Examiner rejected claims 9, 10, 12 and 18-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Simon (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0040375) in view of Guttman (U.S. Patent No. 6,336,918). Applicants respectfully traverse for at least the following reasons.

Cited Art

Simon discloses a system and method for organizing digital images on a page. Simon is directed towards a system software product and method for organizing a plurality of design images in a predetermined page format. The digital images are grouped in a plurality of different page layouts. The page layouts are then analyzed in accordance with the predetermined criteria. Finally, a page layout is selected based on the predetermined criteria. The primary goal of Simon is to optimize a page layout that minimizes the cost function where the cost function is equal to the white space on the page.

The Examiner's secondary reference is Guttman. Guttman is a computer implemented optimization of publication layouts. Guttman teaches a computer implemented system which generates and evaluates a large number of publication layouts and selects an optimum layout. The optimum layout has an optimal relationship between the placement of advertisements and stories on the pages of the publication, the maximization of revenues and minimization of printing costs.

Independent claims 9, 12, 18, 19, 20 and 21 are not unpatentable over Simon in view of Guttman.

The Examiner rejected all independent claims as being unpatentable over Simon in view of Guttman. The Examiner acknowledges that the references fail to explicitly state a document intent vector. However, the Examiner claims that Simon in view of

Guttman teaches optimization of page layouts through minimization of cost functions where modifying, scoring and comparing new page layouts are determined through the utilization of algorithms. Furthermore, the Examiner claims that Guttman discloses a method of optimization where weights are determined based on aesthetics of the layout, cost of the layout, etc.

However, the Examiner fails to show where the quantitative document intent information is used in conjunction with matrix of weights for each value property as stated in each of the independent claims. Each of the claims state that quantitative document intent coordinates with the matrix of weights for each document intent coordinate. Even if the references state that cost is a factor (which may use a quantitative number) neither of the references, alone or in combination, suggest that each document intent coordinate relates to a quantitative document intent. As stated in all of the independent claims, a matrix of weights gives a quantitative contribution to each value property, not just cost. Therefore, it is respectfully requested that the rejections to independent claims 9, 12, 18, 19, 20 and 21 are withdrawn.

The Examiner also states that the combination of Simon and Guttman also suggest a document intent vector. However, the Applicants failed to see any evidence of a suggestion that relates to a vector. As stated above, the vectors also have a quantitative value which enables the subject application to derive a quantitative result. Because Simon and Guttman do not utilize quantitative values for each intent they cannot and do not suggest a matrix of weights that give contribution to each value property of the document intent coordinate of the intent vector. It is therefore respectfully requested that the rejections to these claims be withdrawn and the application be allowed.

Dependent Claims 10, 20 and 22 are in condition for allowance.

All dependent claims remaining in the application are either directly or indirectly dependent from one of the independent claims stated above. Because all of the independent claims are in condition for allowance, it follows that the claims dependent therefrom are also in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above. It is hereby requested that the rejections to these claims also be withdrawn. Therefore, it is

submitted that all claims remaining in the application are currently in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons detailed above, it is submitted all remaining claims (Claims 9, 10, 12 and 18-22) are now in condition for allowance. The foregoing comments do not require unnecessary additional search or examination.

☒ This is an authorization under 37 CFR 1.136(a)(3) to treat any concurrent or future reply, requiring a petition for extension of time, as incorporating a petition for the appropriate extension of time.

☒ The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any filing or prosecution fees which may be required, under 37 CFR 1.16, 1.17, and 1.21 (but not 1.18), or to credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account 24-0037.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, he/she is hereby authorized to call Joseph D. Dreher, at Telephone Number (216) 861-5582.

Respectfully submitted,

FAY SHARPE LLP



Joseph D. Dreher, Reg. No. 37,123
Eric W. Lee, Reg. No. 58,857
1100 Superior Avenue, Seventh Floor
Cleveland, OH 44114-2579
216-861-5582

July 2, 2008

Date

N:\XERZ\200809\US\GBS0003131V001.DOCX